REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-31 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 21-30 have been amended. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-31 remain pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In item 4 on pages 2-18 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-27, and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,898,836, issued to Freivald et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Freivald") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,910,071, issued to Quintero et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Quintero"). In item 8 on page 18 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 8, 18, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Freivald in view of Quintero, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078044, issued to Song et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Song"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application recites "a keyword extracting unit which extracts one or more keywords from an updating area detected by said event detecting unit; [and] an information searching unit which searches the documents in said registered information collecting destination sites by using the keyword extracted by said keyword extracting unit." The Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach at least these features of claim 1.

The Examiner acknowledged that Greivald does not disclose the above cited features of claim 1, but went on to allege that the features are disclosed in Quintero. Quintero discloses a system in which a user registers one or more websites which are then monitored at predetermined intervals to detect change in the text of the websites. The change is detected according to the frequency of various keywords in the text of the websites, these keywords also being previously registered by the user (Column 3, Lines 49-63). In other words, the text of the website is checked to see if the instance of the previously registered keywords is different after the change in the text. The Applicant respectfully submits that Quintero disclose no extraction of keywords.

The Examiner stated that Quintero discloses the extraction of keywords from an updating area in Column 4, Line 48 through Column 5, Line 6. However, the Applicant respectfully

submits that it is apparent from the Examiner's cited section, as well as the remainder of the disclosure, that this is a simple comparison of text, and no extraction is being performed. Extraction implies that the updated areas of the text are being analyzed for keywords, which are then taken, as in one example embodiment enabled by claim 1 of the present application, from the text to perform some other operation. However, as previously discussed, the keywords are simply being compared for rate of use in Quintero. "If any one of the keyword counts for the new page differs from the corresponding keyword count for the previous version, then a change is declared between the current and previous text only versions" (Column 4, Lines 58-62). Therefore, there is no extraction, simply a statistical comparison. No extraction is performed because all of the keywords have already been registered by the user. "For web based services, users may be given an account where the users specify a list of information sources, some of which may be in the form of web pages identified by the (URLs) to be monitored and specify associated keywords, or other more complex criteria, that are of a particular interest to the users" (Column 3, Lines 16-22). It is apparent that all of the keywords compared in the document comparison are previously registered by the user, and therefore no extraction is taking place.

This is in direct contrast to claim 1, in which one or more keywords are extracted from an updating area detected by an event detecting unit. Extracting the keywords allows the search for the keywords in registered information collecting destination sites to obtain more information. In one example embodiment enabled by claim 1 and discussed in the present application, if an updating area of an event collecting destination site has an announcement on a new product which a user has previously not heard of, the information collecting apparatus may extract keywords regarding the new product to search other registered sites for reviews and such for the new product. This would not be possible with the system of Quintero, as the new product identifiers would not be extracted. In fact, the new product identifiers would not even be recognized by the system of Quintero, because they would not be previously registered.

In the Examiner's Response to Arguments, in item 6 on page 22 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that "keyword extraction is taught in terms of keyword change detection" in Quintero. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that no one skilled in the art would consider the keyword change detection in Quintero, which is simply a comparison of two documents for occurrences of a registered keyword, as any type of keyword extraction.

Further, the Examiner alleged that Quintero discloses an information searching unit which searches the documents in the registered information collecting destination sites by using the keyword extracted by the keyword extracting unit, citing Column 3, Lines 1-16 and Column 4, Line 48 through Column 5, Line 6. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that no such

information collecting destination sites are even contemplated in Quintero. The Examiner has already alleged that the registered websites are the same sites at which the keyword comparison is taking place, which would make them more comparable to the event collecting destination sites recited in claim 1 of the present application. In other words, the Examiner stated that the registered websites of Quintero are monitored for changes in the text using the registered keywords, and then those same websites are used as the information collecting destination sites. This is in direct contrast to claim 1 of the present application, which clearly recites that the event collecting destination sites are used to detect the updating area, and that updating area is used to extract the keywords to be used in searching the information collecting destination sites. Quintero only discloses the registering of the sites to be monitored for change, not taking keywords from those sites and then searching other registered sites for the extracted keywords. Therefore, as previously discussed, it would not be possible in the system of Quintero to extract a new keyword from a registered site monitored for change, and then use that keyword to search registered information·collecting destination sites for information regarding the extracted keyword.

In other words, an example embodiment enabled by the recited features of claim 1 eliminates the necessity for the user to set a keyword or the like, and makes it possible, even for unknown information, to collect information from a plurality of information providers on behalf of the user. Unlike the cited references, there is no need for the user to set a word for specifying information, such as the keywords discussed in Quintero. It is thus possible to reduce the capacity of the work memory and to achieve more accurate searching. None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, provide this advantage.

In the Examiner's Response to Arguments, in item 6 on page 21 of the Office Action, responding to the Applicant's assertion that Quintero does not disclose the information collecting destination site registering discussed above, the Examiner stated that "Quintero discloses monitoring changes in data content by extracting keyword and detecting their changes....An update has occurred and that is why the keyword change detection is monitored." The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's response apparently has no bearing on the argument as offered. In fact, the Examiner seems to be supporting the Applicant's assertion that Quintero only discloses monitoring the registered websites for changes. There is not even any contemplation in Quintero of taking a keyword from one of those sites and searching for information regarding the keyword in another registered information collecting site.

Also, the Examiner has not addressed the Applicant's argument that the disclosure of Quintero and Freivald teach away from one another. As acknowledged by the Examiner,

Freivald is concerned with providing the user with an indication of how significant a change is, so Freivald allows a user to register only a portion of the web document so as to monitor the change in only that section. This is in direct contrast to Quintero, which converts the entire document to a text only format, and compares the changes throughout. Further, this also obviously contradicts Freivald's stated goal of reducing storage requirements, as again Quintero discloses not only storing the entire page, but also storing two versions of the page – one in HTML format and one in text only format. Therefore, not only does Quintero not offer any assistance in reaching the stated goals of Freivald, it actually exacerbates the problems that Freivald is attempting to avoid. "Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifiying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art" (MPEP 2143.01). "The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination." In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not adequately addressed the arguments offered by the Applicant, and thus the finality of this Office Action is improper.

Further, as Song merely discloses a system for automatically classifying documents by category using a genetic algorithm and a term cluster, Song does not cure the deficiencies of Freivald and Quintero regarding claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references, either taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests at least these features of claim 1. For a proper §103 rejection, the cited references must disclose all of the features of the rejected claim. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Examiner's §103 rejection.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-10 also patentably disintguish over the cited references.

Further, claims 11, 21, and 31 recite similar features to those discussed in regard to claim 1. As none of the cited references disclose or suggest at least these features, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11, 21, and 31 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claims 12-20 and 22-30 depend from claims 11 and 21, respectively, and include all of

the features of those respective claims plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12-20 and 22-30 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Summary

In accordance with the remarks above, claims 21-30 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-31 remain pending in the application.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 05/09/07

By: Thomas J. Jones
Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501